UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,866	11/26/2001	Jin-Soo Lee	LGE-0017	3275

34610 7590 01/12/2005	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP	ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	
P.O. BOX 221200		
CHANTILLY, VA 20153	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2165	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/991,866	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1-23*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   The amendment filed on August 2, 2004 has been received and entered. Claims 1-23 are

pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-12, and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Vaithilingam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0159640 A1) in view of Riverieulx de Varax (U.S.

Patent No. 6,507,841 B2).

As to claim 1, Vaithilingam et al. discloses a multimedia retrieval method, comprising:

providing multimedia data having a multimedia descriptor including a designated set of

descriptors (See Vaithilingam et al. page 4, paragraphs 0034-0035);

determining a descriptor weight in accordance with a combination of descriptors for each

descriptor of at least one subset of the designated set of descriptors (See Vaithilingam et al.

abstract, also see Vaithilingam et al. pages 3-4, paragraphs 0024-0029, wherein "subset of

descriptors is disclosed, also see Vaithilingam et al. page 4, paragraph 0033, wherein

"combination of descriptors" is disclosed);

associating the descriptor weight to the multimedia descriptor (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4, paragraphs 0027-0028); and

retrieving a multimedia object based on a selected weight corresponding to the combination of descriptors for the query (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5, paragraph 0036).

<u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> does not teach based upon a relation between at least one descriptor of the at least one subset and at least one descriptor of the designated set of descriptors that is not included in the at least one subset.

<u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> teaches based upon a relation between at least one descriptor of the at least one subset and at least one descriptor of the designated set of descriptors that is not included in the at least one subset (See <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 2, lines 1-37, also see <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 4, lines 23-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> to include based upon a relation between at least one descriptor of the at least one subset and at least one descriptor of the designated set of descriptors that is not included in the at least one subset.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> by the teaching of <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> to include based upon a relation between at least one descriptor of the at least one subset and at least one descriptor of the designated set of descriptors that is not included in the at least one subset because it provides for efficient and accurate retrieval and descriptor associated method (See <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 1, lines 30-40).

As to claim 2, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein determining the descriptor weight is accomplished through a prior retrieval result of retrieving images, using the combination of descriptors, or a feedback given by a user regarding a similar object in connection with group data on any similar objects defined in advance (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> pages 6-7, paragraphs 0039-41, wherein "prior" reads on "history", also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 3, paragraphs 0023-0024, wherein "group data" reads on "clustering").

As to claim 3, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein descriptors that identify increasing similarity between the similar objects are provided increasingly higher descriptor weights (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5, paragraphs 0036-0037).

As to claim 4, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses further comprising:

measuring a similarity on the similar object, for which the user gave feedback, or the prior retrieval result using every descriptor weight included in the multimedia descriptor (See <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 3, lines 47-55); and

retrieving the multimedia object based on the selected weight outputting a highest similarity (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> pages 3-4, paragraphs 0026-0029, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5, paragraph 0037).

As to claim 5, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein if a user selects a particular descriptor for the retrieval, only the descriptor weight of the particular descriptor selected, from the combination of descriptors included in the multimedia descriptor, is used for

the retrieval (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 8, claims 8-11 language).

As to claim 6, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein if a user designates a

query object and a retrieval object, only the combination of descriptors corresponding with the

retrieval object and the query object is used for the retrieval (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 7,

paragraphs 0043-0045, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 8, claim 12 language).

As to claim 7, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> discloses a multimedia retrieval method, comprising:

determining a descriptor weight of a query for the multimedia retrieval (See <u>Vaithilingam</u>

<u>et al.</u> page 8, claim 10 language);

associating the descriptor weight to a multimedia descriptor (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page

5, paragraphs 0036-0038); and

retrieving a multimedia object based on a selected weight corresponding to the query,

among other descriptor weights included in the multimedia descriptor (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u>

page 5, paragraphs 0037-0038, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4, paragraphs 0028-0029).

<u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> does not teach in accordance with a viewpoint.

<u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> teaches in accordance with a viewpoint (See <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u>

column 4, lines 23-48, also see <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 5, lines 17-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> to include in accordance with a

viewpoint.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. by the teaching of Riverieulx de Varax to include in accordance with a viewpoint because associating the query with a viewpoint based on user prior selections or feedback provides for more accurate user customized results.

As to claim 8, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses wherein determining the descriptor weight is accomplished through a prior retrieval result from retrieving images or feedback given by a user regarding a similar object, in connection with group data on any similar objects defined in advance (See Vaithilingam et al. pages 6-7, paragraphs 0039-41, wherein "prior" reads on "history", also see Vaithilingam et al. page 3, paragraphs 0023-0024, wherein "group data" reads on "clustering", also see Vaithilingam et al. page 7, paragraph 0045).

As to claim 9, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses wherein a descriptor that identifies increasing similarity between the similar objects is provided a higher descriptor weight (See Vaithilingam et al. page 5, paragraphs 0036-0037).

As to claim 10, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses further comprising:

measuring a similarity on the similar object, for which the user gave feedback, or the prior retrieval result using every descriptor weight included in the multimedia descriptor (See Riverieulx de Varax column 3, lines 17-67, also see Riverieulx de Varax column 4, lines 38-48); and retrieving the multimedia object based on the selected weight outputting a highest similarity (See Vaithilingam et al. pages 3-4, paragraphs 0026-0029, also see Vaithilingam et al. page 5,

paragraph 0037).

As to claim 11, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses further comprising:

displaying a particular viewpoint of the query, among other viewpoints of the query (See

<u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 4, lines 23-48, also see <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 5, lines 17-50);

and retrieving the multimedia object based on the particular viewpoint of the query selected by a

user (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5, paragraph 0037).

As to claim 12, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> discloses a multiweight generating method,

comprising:

obtaining a weight value representing an importance of a descriptor included in a

multimedia object (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5, paragraphs 0036-0037).

<u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> does not teach obtaining data on a viewpoint of a query for obtaining

the weight value.

<u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> teaches obtaining data on a viewpoint of a query for obtaining the

weight value (See <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 3, lines 17-55, also see <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u>

column 5, lines 16-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> to include obtaining data on a

viewpoint of a query for obtaining the weight value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> by the teaching of <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u>

to include obtaining data on a viewpoint of a query for obtaining the weight value because

associating the query with a viewpoint based on user prior selections or feedback provides for

more accurate user customized results.

As to claim 14, Vaithilingam et al. discloses a multimedia retrieval medium, comprising:

a plurality of descriptors that identify a multimedia object, for retrieval from a

multimedia source (See Vaithilingam et al. page 5, paragraph 0036); and

a data feature containing an optimum weight data in accordance with each combination

of descriptors for a query (See Vaithilingam et al. page 5, paragraph 0037).

Vaithilingam et al. does not teach wherein the optimum weight accounts for a relatedness

between at least one descriptor of the combination of descriptors and at least one descriptor of a

designated set of descriptors for the multimedia source that is not in the combination of

descriptors selected for the query.

Riverieulx de Varax teaches wherein the optimum weight accounts for a relatedness

between at least one descriptor of the combination of descriptors and at least one descriptor of a

designated set of descriptors for the multimedia source that is not in the combination of

descriptors selected for the query (See Riverieulx de Varax column 2, lines 1-37, also see

Riverieulx de Varax column 4, lines 23-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. to include wherein the

optimum weight accounts for a relatedness between at least one descriptor of the combination of

descriptors and at least one descriptor of a designated set of descriptors for the multimedia

source that is not in the combination of descriptors selected for the query.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. by the teaching of Riverieulx de Varax

to include wherein the optimum weight accounts for a relatedness between at least one descriptor

of the combination of descriptors and at least one descriptor of a designated set of descriptors for

the multimedia source that is not in the combination of descriptors selected for the query because

it provides for efficient and accurate retrieval and descriptor associated method (See Riverieulx

de Varax column 1, lines 30-40).

As to claim 15, Vaithilingam et al. discloses wherein the combination of descriptors and

the optimum weights are different (See Vaithilingam et al. page 5, paragraph 0037).

Vaithilingam et al. does not teach depending on a viewpoint of the query.

Riverieulx de Varax teaches depending on a viewpoint of the query (See Riverieulx de

Varax column 4, lines 23-48, also see Riverieulx de Varax column 5, lines 17-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. to include depending on a

viewpoint of the query.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. by the teaching of Riverieulx de Varax

to include depending on a viewpoint of the query because associating the query with a viewpoint

based on user prior selections or feedback provides for more accurate user customized results.

As to claim 16, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> discloses a multimedia retrieval method, comprising:

determining a descriptor weight for each of a plurality of descriptors used in a first

combination to form a multimedia descriptor query (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5, paragraphs

0036-0037),

retrieving a group of first multimedia objects based on the descriptor weights

corresponding to the first combination of descriptors (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 9, paragraphs

0036-0037, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4, paragraph 0028, and see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page

4, paragraph 0033).

<u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> does not teach based upon a relation between at least one of the

descriptors in the first combination and at least one descriptor of designated set of the

multimedia descriptor that is not in the first combination.

<u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> teaches based upon a relation between at least one of the descriptors

in the first combination and at least one descriptor of designated set of the multimedia descriptor

that is not in the first combination (See <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 2, lines 1-37, also see

<u>Riverieulx de Varax</u> column 4, lines 23-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> to include based upon a

relation between at least one of the descriptors in the first combination and at least one descriptor

of designated set of the multimedia descriptor that is not in the first combination.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> by the teaching of <u>Riverieulx de Varax</u>

to include based upon a relation between at least one of the descriptors in the first combination

and at least one descriptor of designated set of the multimedia descriptor that is not in the first

combination because it provides for efficient and accurate retrieval and descriptor associated

method (See Riverieulx de Varax column 1, lines 30-40).

As to claim 17, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses further comprising:

determining the descriptor weight for each of a plurality of descriptors used in a second

combination to form a subsequent multimedia descriptor query (See Vaithilingam et al. page 5,

paragraph 0037);

retrieving a group of second multimedia objects based on the descriptor weights

corresponding to the second combination of descriptors (See Vaithilingam et al. page 8, claims

4-5 language, also see Vaithilingam et al. page 4, paragraph 0028, and see Vaithilingam et al.

page 4, paragraph 0033), wherein the group of second multimedia objects has a higher

correlation to a desired multimedia object than the group of first multimedia objects (See

Vaithilingam et al. page 8, claims 5-10 language).

As to claim 18, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses wherein:

the descriptor weights for the plurality of descriptors used in the second combination

distinguish a particular multimedia object selected from the group of first multimedia objects

from all other multimedia objects within the group of first multimedia objects (See Vaithilingam

et al. page 8, claims 10-13 language).

As to claim 19, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein:

the descriptor weights for the plurality of descriptors used in the second combination

distinguish a particular multimedia feature selected from a group of features associated with the

group of first multimedia objects from all other multimedia objects within the group of first

multimedia objects (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 8, claims 5-8 language).

As to claim 20, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses further comprising:

(a) replacing the first combination of descriptors and associated descriptor weights with

the second combination of descriptors and associated descriptor weights (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u>

page 5, paragraphs 0036-0038, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 3, paragraphs 0023-0025);

(b) replacing the group of first multimedia objects with the group of second multimedia

objects (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 3, paragraphs 0023-0026, and see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page

4, paragraphs 0027-0034);

(c) determining the descriptor weight for each of the plurality of descriptors used in a

new determination of the second combination to form the subsequent multimedia descriptor

query, based on the particular multimedia object selected by a user from the group of first

multimedia objects (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 8, claims 10-13 language); and

(d) retrieving the group of second multimedia objects based on the descriptor weights

corresponding to the second combination of descriptors (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 3,

paragraphs 0023-0025, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4, paragraph 0033, also see

<u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4, paragraph 0028); and

repeating steps (a) through (d) in sequence until the group of second multimedia objects

reaches a predetermined level of correlation with a desired multimedia object (See Vaithilingam

et al. page 9, claim 20 language, also see Vaithilingam et al. page 3, paragraphs 0024-0025).

As to claim 21, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses further comprising:

(a) replacing the first combination of descriptors and associated descriptor weights with

the second combination of descriptors and associated descriptor weights (See Vaithilingam et al.

page 5, paragraphs 0036-0038, also see Vaithilingam et al. page 3, paragraphs 0023-0025);

(b) replacing the group of first multimedia objects with the group of second multimedia

objects (See page 3, paragraphs 0023-0026, and see page 4, paragraphs 0027-0034);

(c) determining the descriptor weight for each of the plurality of descriptors used in a

new determination of the second combination to form the subsequent multimedia descriptor

query, based on the particular multimedia feature selected by a user from the group of first

multimedia objects (See Vaithilingam et al. page 5, paragraphs 0036-0038); and

(d) retrieving the group of second multimedia objects based on the descriptor weights

corresponding to the second combination of descriptors (See Vaithilingam et al. page 4,

paragraphs 0027-0029); and

repeating steps (a) through (d) in sequence until the group of second multimedia objects

reaches a predetermined level of correlation with a desired multimedia object (See Vaithilingam

et al. page 5, paragraphs 0036-0037).

As to claim 22, Vaithilingam et al. as modified discloses wherein:

the group of features associated with the group of first multimedia objects is identified by

a tabulation of textual descriptions of the features (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 8, claim 12

language).

As to claim 23, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein:

the group of features associated with the group of first multimedia objects is identified by

a tabulation of mathematical representations of the features (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4,

paragraphs 0033-0034, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 6, paragraph 0039).

4.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Vaithilingam et</u>

<u>al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0159640 A1) in view of <u>Arora et al.</u> (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0013760 A1).

As to claim 13, <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> discloses a multiweight generating method,

comprising:

obtaining a weight value representing an importance (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 5,

paragraph 0037) of each descriptor of a combination of descriptors included in a multimedia

object (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4, paragraph 0028, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 4,

paragraph 0033); obtaining data corresponding to the descriptor that indicates what the descriptor

intends to describe (See <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> page 2, paragraph 0019, also see <u>Vaithilingam et al.</u>

page 3, paragraph 0022);

<u>Vaithilingam et al.</u> does not teach generating multiweigths for each descriptor from the

obtained data according to the combination descriptors; and

incorporating the multiweighted descriptors in a multimedia descriptor of multimedia data containing the multimedia object, wherein a weight of the multiweighted descriptor is automatically selected for the combination of descriptors upon execution of a multimedia descriptor query.

Arora et al. teaches generating multiweigths for each descriptor from the obtained data according to the combination descriptors (See Arora et al. page 6, paragraphs 0067-0068, also see Arora et al. page5, paragraph 0058, also see Arora et al. page 5, paragraph 0061); and

incorporating the multiweighted descriptors in a multimedia descriptor of multimedia data containing the multimedia object, wherein a weight of the multiweighted descriptor is automatically selected for the combination of descriptors upon execution of a multimedia descriptor query (See Arora et al. page 5, paragraphs 0056-0058, wherein "combination" is disclosed, also see Arora et al. pages 11-12, paragraph 0145).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. to include generating multiweigths for each descriptor from the obtained data according to the combination descriptors; and incorporating the multiweighted descriptors in a multimedia descriptor of multimedia data containing the multimedia object, wherein a weight of the multiweighted descriptor is automatically selected for the combination of descriptors upon execution of a multimedia descriptor query.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Vaithilingam et al. by the teaching of Arora et al. to include generating multiweigths for each descriptor from the obtained data according to the

combination descriptors; and incorporating the multiweighted descriptors in a multimedia

descriptor of multimedia data containing the multimedia object, wherein a weight of the

multiweighted descriptor is automatically selected for the combination of descriptors upon

execution of a multimedia descriptor query because it allows for faster and more accurate search

retrieval and matching.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, in response to applicant's outstanding argument with regard to claim 7 that

"Riverieulx de Varax does not teach or suggest in accordance with viewpoint" is acknowledged

but is not deemed to be persuasive.

The Examiner maintains that Riverieulx de Varax teaches a query view point in column

3, lines 11-46 wherein a query viewpoint is interpreted to read on "the value of weight is

statistically determined by searches" and "at a particular instant in time" indicating that

depending on the query the descriptor with the assigned weight will be the calculated to be of

relevance and that is dynamic relationship that changes from search to another. Also see

Riverieulx de Varax column 4, lines 23-57, wherein the query is associated with different

descriptors according to the search sought. Therefore, the view point will be different from query

to another.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

      A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

      If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4038. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil
January 10, 2005

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER